DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 125 JC 750 432

AUTHOR	Bender, Louis W.
TITLE	The States, Communities, and Control of the Community College: Issues and Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Shell Companies Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	63p.
AVAILABLE FROM	AACJC Publications, Box 298, Alexandria, Virginia 22314 ($1.50)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	College Role; *Community Control; Federal State Relationship; *Governance; Governing Boards; *Government Role; *Junior Colleges; Political Power; State Agencies; *State Boards of Education; Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

The steady drift toward state control of community college education is a growing issue of concern. This movement has not come from significant changes in the authority or responsibilities of the state community college boards or agencies so much as from a variety of other national and state precursors. This document attempts to establish the context of this phenomenon and then suggest recommendations for action which would address several of the emerging issues involved. These include: (1) defining and communicating the mission of community college education; (2) determining the locus of policy-making; (3) untangling overlapping jurisdictions; (4) preventing "internecine warfare" among post-secondary institutions in a free-market atmosphere; and (5) encouraging local initiative in the political process. Discussed in some depth are the precursors of state control and the mission of the "college of the community". The major recommendations call for realistic assessment of power bases within and outside of the college, formation of a state community college agency with an advocacy role defending community-based institutions, and substantive local participation in policy-making. (MJK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110125

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

One Dupont Circle/N.W./Suite 410/Washington/D.C. 20036/202-293-7050

THE STATES, COMMUNITIES, AND CONTROL OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Issues and Recommendations

By: Louis W. Bender

JC 750 432

THE STATES, COMMUNITIES, AND CONTROL OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Issues and Recommendations

By: Louis W. Bender

This paper deals with the shift from local to state control of community colleges in America. The author discusses causes behind the trend, issues involved, and the implications for institutional development. He offers suggestions and recommendations for meeting the challenge of change in control. Louis W. Bender is professor of higher education at Florida State University, specializing in community college administration and faculty development, and director of the Center for State and Regional Higher Education at Florida State. The essay is presented by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, One Dupont Circle, N. W., Washington, D. C., with support from the Shell Companies Foundation. Copies are available at a cost of $1.50 each from the Association.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

Copyright 1975:
American Association of Community
and Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Printed in U.S.A.

The States, Communities, and Control of the Community College
by Louis W. Bender

Section I

Storm Clouds on the Horizon

> Control by federal and state governments continues to advance like a new ice age. Realization of the seeming inevitability of this advance, rather than its sudden occurrence, will constitute the shock, if indeed the glacial spread cannot be halted.[1]

Six years after its establishment for the purpose of studying the condition and future of higher education in the United States from the 1970s toward the year 2000, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education presented its priorities for action to the nation. Built with a cornerstone of hope and optimism, those priorities, nevertheless, reflect the possible turbulence which can have negative impacts upon colleges and universities during the last quarter of this century. Analysis of the final report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education quickly reveals a variety of dangers and problems which must be addressed with courage and vigor.

---

1 Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973, p. 56.

The decentralized design of postsecondary education in the United States was viewed by the Commission as one of the greatest strengths when contrasted with the centralized national systems of many other countries. It is sobering, therefore, to read the conclusion reached by the Commission after six years of studies and research:

> Our greatest single concern at the present time, however, is that in some states 'superboards' and legislators and governors are now exercising too much detailed policy and administrative control over institutions of higher education and unduly infringing upon their essential independence, are neglecting higher education too much financially, and controlling it too much administratively.[2]

Two years prior to that final report, Clark Kerr, Chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, made essentially the same observation when suggesting that the increasing state control by coordinating agencies

> ... has turned higher education increasingly into a quasi-public utility with its prices (tuition and budget) controlled outside the campus, its services, (functions) specified, and its customers (through admissions policies) determined; and with outside agencies also prepared to hear complaints about prices, services, and the acceptance and rejection of customers. The campus is less part of free enterprise and more part of the controlled public domain.[3]

---

[2] Ibid., p.59.

[3] Foreword statement in Lee, Eugene C., and Brown, Frank W. The Multi-Campus University, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

At a meeting of Past Chief Elected Officers of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges convened January 3-4, 1975 by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., one of the agenda items was entitled: "What's ahead of us on the horizon?" Past presidents from 1966 through 1972 of the AAJC and the chairman of the boards of the reconstituted AACJC from 1972 identified "the drift toward state control" as a major concern of the future. It is to these concerns that this monograph is addressed.

Typically, those discussing the issue of the drift toward state control of community colleges have in mind a state level agency responsible for administering statutory and regulatory provisions for the public community colleges of that state. College presidents immediately visualize a state director for community colleges and the increasing number of forms and reports which must be submitted to his office as "the state." The drift toward state control, however, has not come from significant changes in the authority or responsibilities of the state community college agencies so much as from a variety of other national and state precursors.

Honey and Hartle have developed a succinct but graphic description of the historical evolution of federal influence upon the direction and organization of higher education. Initially, with the earliest federal land-grants for higher education in the Northwest Territory, a clear posture of

detachment from control issues could be observed. Gradually, however, Congress began to shape the direction and organization of higher education as it first specified that institutions endowed with federal funds be state controlled, and by 1890 the second Morrill Act included requirements for federal supervision of the application of funds as well as requirements that land-grant college presidents submit annual reports to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury. "During the next sixty years the trend was toward greater federal insistence on the right to supervise the states' use of the vast sums distributed for education and social welfare purposes."[4]

The variety of grants and contracts emanating from the federal government to colleges and universities over the years would reflect the emergence of various national concerns whether responding to needs of the agrarian, industrial, and technological eras or to the pattern of crisis intervention for wars or national disasters. Two subtle but significant dimensions can be examined as federal legislation has emerged. One is the way in which federal legislation has shaped and reshaped the organizational configuration of postsecondary

---

[4] John C. Honey and Terry W. Hartle, Federal-State-Institutional Relations in Postsecondary Education, Educational Finance and Governance Center, Syracuse University Research Corporation, February, 1975, p.11.

education. The other, both more subtle and ambiguous, is the legislative interpretation of societal demands to be met.

The first legislation enacted after World War II not directed toward national defense was the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. Not only did that legislation create an organizational structure at the state level charged with administering and monitoring the program but it also called for the development of statewide plans for higher education. This federal influence closed forever the claim or reality (if there was any) of institutional autonomy. An elaboration upon the implications of this and other federal legislation will be given later; however, it is important to acknowledge that federal legislation has led to considerable uncertainty and confusion for postsecondary education institutions and the states within which they operate.

> At times the federal government appears prepared to work directly with students and institutions. At times it appears to want the state to play a dominant or major role. On other occasions federal policies seem designed to exorcize the states and rely on federal-regional organization as the desirable 'field' approach.[5]

---

[5] Ibid., p.2.

Part of the ambiguity is caused by the difficulty in clearly translating societal demands. Historically, the role of higher education was generally accepted as part of the socialization process. The academic community could argue for academic freedom and autonomy from political involvement because of the imperative need to seek and disseminate truth objectively. The contemporary frustration of society concerning the need for social reconstruction has placed postsecondary education in a new and unfamiliar arena. There are those who maintain that education can and should assume a major responsibility for assisting individuals, communities, states, and even the nation in self development and self renewal. Because of its indigenous nature, the community college has become a prime candidate as an institutional segment of postsecondary education to come to grips with this evolving societal demand. The issue, quite naturally, becomes one of how, and to what degree the community college should either be charged with or assume responsibility for social reconstruction. A concomitant question which follows is whether the mission, program, structure, control, and will of the community college are such that it can respond to this goal even should it assume the charge and responsibility.

The growth and popularity of community colleges over the last decade may have generated a misleading assumption. While numbers of new institutions, increased enrollments, and public

testimony from state and federal legislators have heralded the success story of the community college, the phenomenal popularity of non-traditonal and non-institutional post-secondary education forms and approaches within the last five years is startling evidence that the public (and their elected representatives) are not as interested in or concerned about particular institutional forms as much as in the educational process itself. During a public hearing, a state legislator curtly admonished: "The primary concern of this legislature must be the health of postsecondary education, not institutional health!"

It is in this environment that the community college must chart its course. Any indepth contemplation of the future, based upon an assessment of contemporary realities and past patterns or trends, would suggest the need for serious attention to a series of problems or issues which have formed as storm clouds on the horizon in the future of the community college in the United States. An effort will be made to establish the context of and then suggest recommendations for action which would address several of these emerging issues, including:

1. The Problem of Mission:

   How can the community college clearly establish its mission so that it will be understood both within and without the institution? What can be done to bring about public cognizance of

and governmental support for the community college as a distinct institution with a specific role and scope different from other postsecondary institutions?

2. The Problem of Locus of Policy-making:

How can the community college maintain its individuality and diversity reflective of its indigenous environment in view of the press for standardization and uniformity emanating from federal and state policies and procedures? How can the community college be responsive to community education needs if the locus of policy and priority-making is at the state rather than the local level?

3. The Problem of Overlapping Jurisdictions:

What can be done to counteract or accommodate the growth of overlapping and competing bureaucratic jurisdictions at federal, regional, and state levels which impinge upon the operation of the community college?

4. The Problem of Internecine Warfare:

What can be done to avoid the internecine conflicts among postsecondary education institutions, including community colleges, growing out of competition of the free-market principle which has superseded earlier role and scope philosophies of state coordination? What safeguards can be taken to avoid conflict within the community college sector itself?

5. The Problem of Local Initiative:

What can be done to foster and promote local initiative? How does the local community college interact in the political process so that its mission can be achieved?

In an attempt to address these questions, Sections II and III establish the context. Section IV addresses the implications for public policy with recommendations for action in the years ahead.

Section II

Precursors of State Control

> ... the balance of power in higher education has been most affected by the birth of new agencies within state government.[6]

The relationship of state to local government as well as that between the federal and state government can be portrayed as an ebb and flow of centralization of power and authority in the history of our country. The division of labor envisioned by the founding fathers whereby a major responsibility of the federal government would be national security and a major responsibility of the state governments would be education has never been totally operational or honored by the policy-makers of Congress and state legislatures. "National interest" and "public good" are not always synonymous. Hence, states rights have been vigorously championed by those who argue for the principle that man determines his own destiny reflecting the pluralistic nature of the regions and sections of this nation. The guarantees of equality and the opportunity of a free people are, on the other hand, concomitant

---

[6] James L. Wattenbarger, "Who Now Has the Power?" Improving Statewide Planning, New Directions for Higher Education, Jossey-Bass, Winter, 1974.

with the arguments for national policy and national guarantees of all civil rights, including education.

Federal Precursors

The array of state level agencies having direct or indirect jurisdictional interests which impinge upon the community college can best be illustrated by the growth in requirements fostered by action of the Congress or the Executive Branch of the federal government. National policy can be seen in the results of various federal laws and programs which have set the stage for innumerable impingements upon the institution. It should be acknowledged, however, that most federal legislation has been of the incentive type, designed to lure or otherwise attract compliance rather than to mandate it.

With the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1957, the first major gravitational pull upon institutional leadership occurred. Many administrators and policy-makers of the school district-rooted public junior colleges demonstrated their response to that gravitational pull of external funds in spite of all potential consequences. They sought to enjoy the "best of two worlds" by, on the one hand, showing willingness to sign appropriate letters of declaration confirming they were components of school districts and thus qualifying institutions for NDEA funds designed to improve counseling programs, science, mathematics, foreign language, and reading

disciplines as well as audio visual aids at the elementary and secondary school levels. On the other hand, many of the same institutions were working vigorously to be viewed as full-fledged members of the "higher education community" in their respective states, urging the then American Association of Junior Colleges to champion national recognition of the two-year colleges as accepted components of higher education.

The National Defense Education Act of 1957 also fostered a variety of state level offices or units charged with reviewing, approving, monitoring, and subsequently auditing the programs, utilization, and funding of the federally initiated programs. Many of the offices, units or bureaus established in departments of education in various states as a result of this Act still exist as living testimony of this early precursor of state level control.

The temptation to yield to such federal level enticement, of course, had existed earlier for many of these institutions, particularly through the various federal vocational education acts providing for categorical funds. With the inception of the first federal vocational education legislation provided through the Smith-Hughes Act we find tightly written provisions which set out in detail precisely what state and local officials must do to receive reimbursement for vocational programs. Subsequent regulatory provisions covered such matters as student characteristics of enrollees, space and

equipment specifications, form and content of instruction, qualifications of instructors and administrators, length of school day, week and year as well as many other rules. These were prescribed at both federal and state levels, usurping institutional determination.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 created one of the federal programs for which both the earlier school-district-rooted junior colleges and also the newly established community colleges were enticed to seek funds because of fiscal provisions for postsecondary vocational and technical education. The separate administrative structure for vocational education encompassing federal, state and local levels was another major determinant of state impingement upon the local two-year institution. While some states, such as North Carolina, Iowa, and Oregon, were to resolve the jurisdictional conflicts between agencies charged with responsibility for public two-year colleges and the office of vocational education, others, such as Massachussetts, Alabama, and Washington, engaged in internecine warfare which had reverberations down to and throughout local institutional levels. A few states, such as Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California, worked out "gentlemen's agreements" whereby a provision for postsecondary vocational education funding was made to accommodate the requirements of the community colleges while the overall jurisdiction and responsibility remained with the state office for vocational education.

Additional federal legislation in 1963, 1965, and 1969, created yet new state-level commissions, agencies or units having responsibility for federal programs for which two-year colleges as well as other types of institutions of higher education qualified and thus were obligated to come under state-level monitoring and, in some cases, even control. Illustrations include the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, 1965, and 1967, which in most states resulted in the creation of a new commission charged with developing statewide criteria and formulas whereby priorities for institutional awards could be made among both public and private sectors and among the various segments of institutions. This legislation spawned new requirements for institutional reporting when Congress found the information and data systems of the 50 states woefully inadequate and the reports from individual colleges and universities highly unreliable.

The Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), designed to gather accurate and uniform information on facilities and space utilization, subsequently was expanded by federal bureaucrats to include academic programs, student enrollments, and faculty and staff profiles. HEGIS requirements became burdens upon individual institutions from the standpoint of time and resources consumed, particularly when no direct benefit could be enjoyed by direct feedback or other measurable values. Nevertheless, history will record that HEGIS

obligations, including the offices or units created within state offices charged with higher education, was a consequence of institutional response to federal governmental legislation.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 further added to the drift toward state level involvement when monies were used to entice states to create student financial aid agencies to provide scholarship or loan monies to meet egalitarian objectives. Because of the absence of any previous machinery or structure to accommodate processing and operation of student aid applications from public and private colleges, universities, technical institutes and other educational delivery systems, entirely new commissions or agencies were created by many state legislatures in response to the demands of the public for greater access on the one hand and the alluring pull of federal dollars on the other. New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois and numerous other states created state higher education student assistance agencies which in turn created the need for further specialization at the local college level.

Federal funds support large numbers of employees in state departments of education. Every federal program from 1963 included some provision for creating or strengthening state level administrative units. In addition to a portion of each federal program appropriation being earmarked to support administrative

personnel at the state level, Title V called for strengthening state agencies and resulted in an additional infusion of personnel, some whose major purpose is to streamline internal functions but who often become involved in surveys, information system design, and other activities which ultimately touch each institution. These units within state government have generated an entirely new layer of authority and red tape. Created to establish more efficiency in state government, these units often assume broad powers in the name of economy and efficiency. As a consequence, standardization of forms, procedures and even requirements frequently are foisted upon operating state agencies and their constituents. Personnel boards, departments of general services, purchasing departments and building commissions typically have such internal constraints or demands which usually are reflected directly or indirectly in relationships with local institutions. Often these standardized uniform requirements thwart or at least limit the ability of the local college to respond to community needs. Even the evaluation process of these agencies and the legislature tend to restrict local decision-making by evaluating administrative decisions and operations through standardized criteria which may or may not take into account community differences or the educational value of the action.

With the various federal programs, conflicts developed in some states between major officials, such as directors of

vocational education, directors of community colleges, chief executive officers of coordinating or governing boards, and officers of other educational organizations and interest groups. These conflicts resulted in a continuing effort of the U. S. Congress to force unity of both academic and vocational sectors. Lobbying efforts of the two-year colleges, for example, sought some form of federal legislation which would give visibility to the community and junior colleges and assure equitable treatment when it came to federal dollars. This was particularly true in the area of vocational education, for, while the Vocational Education Act of 1963 called for state level advisory committees or councils to assist in the development of a state plan for the use of federal vocational dollars, a deliberate "feather bedding" process was used in some states by the vocational education director which excluded the postsecondary vocational and technical education interests. (This bias is reflected in the fact that most of the state directors had originally come from the public school sector.)

Efforts of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the National Council of State Directors of Community/Junior Colleges and others pressed for some resolution of the problem in subsequent federal legislation. Thus, in the Vocational Education Acts of 1965 and 1967, the obligation to provide broad representation on state advisory

committees and the provision that a certain percent of funds must be used for postsecondary education were incorporated into law. Again, however, through various tactics and strategies, a number of states still produced glaring portrayals of autocratic and dictatorial determination of the use of federal vocational education dollars, often to the detriment of the community colleges. The Vocational Education Act of 1968 not only provided that 15 percent of all federal dollars were to be used for postsecondary education, but called for representatives from various types of postsecondary institutions, including community or junior colleges, to be on the state advisory committees. Once more, several states were to reflect blatant disregard for congressional intent, resulting in outcries from the institutions, state agencies, and the national organizations as reflected in the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.

That law calls for a new state level planning body designed to foster unity of all educational interests. Popularly known as the 1202 Commission after the provision of that legislation, these bodies are by law to be representative of all types of postsecondary educational delivery systems, (now for the first time including proprietary institutions) and having veto power over any plan which does not equitably provide for postsecondary vocational education support. While these Commissions are still in their embryonic stages, it is

clear by the fact that more than 47 states created new offices to carry out the provisions of the law that another impingement upon institutional self determination has been generated. A few states have already begun to staff new administering arms to provide secretariat and support services for their 1202 Commissions. This will subsequently result in an organization which has need to justify its existence and, to do so, will place further requirements upon local institutions.

Numerous other federal laws have added to the drift toward state or federal control. Civil rights legislation has created the need for state compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Desegregation provisions forced seven states to submit plans to assure the abolishment of any vestiges of segregation in any educational institutions. Affirmative action provisions under Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 also have created external pressures upon local colleges in personnel policies and practices. Currently, administrative agency review of hiring decisions is concentrated upon affirmative action for minority groups and women. But community college personnel decisions are also subject to scrutiny by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) by the Department of Labor, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). Furthermore, collective bargaining has brought some involvement from the National

Labor Relations Board (NLRB) and many state labor relations commissions.

Less direct, but nevertheless significant influences, can be seen with regard to the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and the successor law called the Comprehensive Education and Training Act. They, too, caused the creation of new state machinery that would have some impact on community colleges.

Another indirect but important federal force for state-level control over the community college can be seen in the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA). Many costly institutional requirements related to physical facilities and space utilization have been promulgated from state administering agencies as a result of this legislation.

The Courts

Another precursor of state-level impingement upon the community college can be observed in the activistic participation of state and federal courts in areas which formerly had been perceived as the private domain of institutions of higher education. With the executive order calling for affirmative action and subsequent court decisions came sanctions or penalties for activities ranging from personnel practices to selection of contractors and jobbers. The role of the courts grew in scope and magnitude. The age of

accountability came rapidly as courts deleted new forms of governing regulations and requirements to provide for consumer protection demands where institutions had previously assumed that the prerogative of determining output was theirs in that the student had traditionally been subject to the highest principles of in loco parentis rather than a consumer with all rights and privileges assured by the judiciary.

One of the significant decisions which relates to community colleges was the 1971 ruling by Chief Justice Warren Burger declaring that tests or even school credentials used for screening candidates for a given job must measure "the man for the job" rather than "the man in the abstract." (Griggs versus Duke Power Company). This landmark decision, related to the civil rights of the individual, is a legal basis for competency or performance-based education and negates much of the power of the credentialing monopoly once held by educational institutions.

Community colleges, as well as four-year colleges and universities, found themselves constantly in need of legal advice and forced to develop written documentation of policies, procedures, and actions which could stand the test of court-room scrutiny. The reverberations of the impingement of the courts have been felt from boards of trustees and presidents to department chairpersons and classroom teachers as well as admissions counselors. No one has been spared the obligation

of accountability in the eyes of the court.

A recent publication of the Committee on Economic Development [illegible]ed the broad range of litigated issues related to students which probably would not have been considered by the courts ten or fifteen years ago:

> Legality of dormitory room searches; confidentiality of student files and records of student organizations; recognition and status of student political groups; administrative control over campus newspapers and other publications; access of insiders and outsiders to campus facilities for meetings and rallies; denial of enrollment in or credit for particular courses as well as degree programs; withdrawal of student government positions or offices from alleged campus wrongdoers; and other comparable issues.[7]

Comparable lists could be developed related to personnel (faculty and support staff), programs, and other areas of college operation which have become litigation issues. Precedent of court decisions now often becomes the basis for a new procedure or monitoring activity for all institutions which can only be carried out by an agency having statewide jurisdiction.

---

[7] Robert M. O'Neill, The Courts, Government and Higher Education, Washington: Committee for Economic Development, 1972, pp.11-12.

The Governor and the Legislature

Yet another area of drift toward state control becomes evident in the perpetual struggle for power and authority which goes on between the executive and legislative branches of government. The ebb and flow of pre-eminence of legislative dominance for a time, only to be replaced by a shift to strong gubernatorial power and authority, can be seen in the staffing patterns and the working relationships of various states. Agencies such as a department of education or a state board for community colleges or a state board for higher education in which community colleges are one of the components usually are viewed as units of the executive branch. During complex or difficult times, and particularly when political power struggles are in progress, the credibility of these agencies is tarnished in the eyes of the members of the legislature who suspect motives and loyalties as being biased toward the incumbent governor and other executive interests. Loss of credibility, whether caused by political suspicions or mediocre performance and responsiveness, has typically resulted in the growth of separate staffs to accommodate legislative committees and individual legislators. With the growth of legislative staffs, another encroachment upon local institutions has occurred as requests for information, often on a seemingly inane or obtuse issue, generate the obligation of institutional response. Often the response

is expected within such a short time period as to force a shift in priorities and internal commitments at the local institution. Some institutions have found themselves victims of witch hunts or vindictive attitudes or actions by disenchanted or alienated legislators or legislative staff members. On the other hand, some institutions have found a new avenue for interacting with the legislature in pursuit of special considerations and thus contribute to a breakdown of the state-system structure by doing "end-runs" for special capital appropriations or other categorical grants. These often are detrimental to other institutions in the system and debilitating to the position of the state agency charged with responsibility for the institutions and the state director as the spokesman for all institutions.

An important phenomenon for community college leaders to understand is the nature of the power struggle in many states between the governor and the legislature. Many, (including some state directors) perceive the struggle as centering upon administrative power and authority over state government. In most cases, however, the struggle is over political power! Governors seek clout when vying in the national partisan political arena and must have a power base from which to operate. Individual legislators have the same motive but on the state level, usually. As a consequence, education issues are often not what educators perceive them to be and become

embroiled in the partisan political process rather than an educational political process. In such cases, few educators have the expertise, power or intestinal fortitude for such a match. Repressive legislation or executive orders have often resulted from these circumstances. Illustrations include minimum faculty contact hour laws, opening or closing professional schools in spite of proven need, and abolishment or creation of coordinating or governing boards.

Other Precursors

Another precursor of state-level control can be seen in the American syndrome of professionalization. The tendency of individuals in the same field of work to come together as a professional organization whether at the trade or union level, the technician, the para-professional level or professional level is evident in the pressures for licensure, certification and other prerequisites for entry into an occupational field or career. State boards for nursing have been able to win legislation which forces institutional compliance to professional requirements. Similar requirements by professional accrediting associations have provided considerable pressure upon institutions to comply. Frequently, the result has been expenditure of time, effort and monies for a college to be approved or recognized and thus to operate. These state agencies, frequently located in the

state capital, usually are affiliates or otherwise are interwoven into the fabric of a national level organization. The collective clout generated by the network of state-level affiliates has generated power for the national level to establish prerequisites used by federal agencies in examining applications or making approvals in the same manner that state agencies do for indigenous institutions.

Still another precursor of the drift toward state control is witnessed in the press for egalitarian benefits. As new or alternative educational delivery systems have evolved, additional authority has surfaced in some states. Proprietary schools, while forcing recognition from state policy bodies, whether legislatures or boards, have been only one type of delivery system which must be considered by leaders of community colleges. With the provision by the New York Regents of credit by examination and a Regents degree combined with open universities such as Empire State or the Thomas A. Edison University, new state-level impingements of a different sort have developed. Recognition of corporate or other non-educational organizations to provide educational services leading to a degree, as illustrated by the authorization of the Arthur D. Little Company to award the Master of Business Administration by the state of Massachussetts, all provide evidence of greater state involvement in the educational enterprise. Many community-based

institutions can see the growing ambition of agencies and organizations within the community to be able to award credit or present a degree for educational experiences.

State Coordination of Higher Education

The growth in authority and responsibility of state coordinating boards and agencies for all of higher education has been one of the more visible forerunners of state control. Not all community colleges come under the purview of such agencies, however, for certain vestiges of school district-sponsorship of some of the earlier states can still be seen in the provision for community colleges to continue under the jurisdiction of state boards or departments of education. In these cases, however, the state boards generally play a coordinating role even though the state coordinating agencies have both directional and procedural influences upon the local community colleges. Considerable power resides in the authority of most of these coordinating boards to develop system-wide planning for all segments of education. Often such boards have authority to review or even approve budgets from the various institutions or statewide segments of institutions.

While the ultimate authority usually rests with the state legislature in establishing priorities and making appropriations, coordinating boards and agencies were created

by most legislatures in the hope that they would foster complementary rather than competitive or duplicative higher education institutions and services. State coordination had its greatest impetus during the decade of the 1960s when many states turned to these boards and agencies for master plans designed to bring about continuity and comprehensive educational services. Note the relationship of this development and the required state plans under the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Analysis of statewide master plans developed during that decade reveals an effort to overcome conflicts by development of role and scope assumptions wherein various segments of institutions were identified with specific missions. Such segments were, in principle at least, to have primary jurisdiction over particular domains. This was especially true in the public sector where state universities were expected to focus upon professional schools and research, teachers colleges would be responsible for training of professionals for the public schools, and community colleges were identified with low cost comprehensive postsecondary education opportunities.

A disquieting shift becomes apparent, however, in revisions of master plans produced in the 1970s. The "free market principle" has become a predominant basic assumption with resulting stress upon multiple options to students.

Federal and state funding has noticeably shifted from institution-centered formulas to student-centered scholarship and loan programs. In stark contrast to the earlier "role and scope" assumption of planning is the free market concept of competition among institutions. "Multiple delivery systems" of postsecondary education as presently enunciated in such plans can be expected to create considerable stress in the future. Joseph P. Cosand, while still U. S. Deputy Commissioner of Education, cautioned against power plays or "turfmanship" activities by different institutions which would result in costly competition and further disenchantment by taxpayers and legislators. The free market direction of recent state master plans may well create turfmanship conflicts among institutions and chaos within postsecondary education which will exceed that which existed when legislatures felt the need to create coordinating boards in the first place.

State Community College Boards/Agencies

Historical Sketch: Almost all public junior colleges prior to World War II were spawned from a school district base (the exception being branch campus structures of state universities which subsequently became comprehensive community colleges, e.g., Kentucky, Nevada, Alaska and Hawaii). Illinois, California, Mississippi, Florida, and Maryland are illustrative of this earliest prototype in which local school

boards were the corporate authority for policy making and operation of junior colleges whereby primary responsibility rested with the state but local policy making and determination were characteristic of the control and program priorities of the institutions.

Following the Second World War two parallel but quite distinct developments occurred. First, egalitarian pressures for educational opportunity resulted in the rapid adoption by states of enabling legislation to establish community colleges. By the mid 1960s some form of comprehensive community college education structure was operational in forty-three different states. The other development was the growing public recognition of the importance of comprehensive junior colleges and their emancipation from school district sponsorship and control. Paradoxically, those public junior colleges formerly sponsored by school districts sought separate control primarily in order to emulate the stereotype of colleges and universities as being characteristic of "higher education." Many presidents of school district-sponsored junior colleges were frustrated by being part of the staff of a superintendent of schools in the same manner as high school principals were frustrated when not viewed as peers with college and university presidents. Some superintendents became embroiled in jurisdictional disputes with their college presidents whose prestige and political support was threatening

to the superintendent. In some instances, the junior college president's salary was higher than that of his superintendent. And thus, during the 1950s and 1960s when school district sponsorship and control was the focus of debate and legislative encounters, a pathway of vanquished and victors could be charted. The archives of such states as Maryland, California, and Florida are rich resources with which to document these historical struggles.

Types of State Structures: Most states which provided for the establishment of public two-year colleges beginning in the 1960s authorized separate jurisdictions from local school districts. The motive of these states, however, was not to assure recognition of the two-year institutions as components of higher education so much as to design structures which would facilitate the establishment, funding, and operation of the institutions. As a result, three different structures evolved: (1) provision of separate local boards of trustees with some state and local funding, (2) provision for state sponsored community college systems, and (3) provision for the creation of comprehensive community-based institutions previously sponsored through universities or state university systems. (Illustrations are given in Table I).

Much discussion has centered around the nature and function of the state agency charged with responsibility for overall coordination and direction of the community colleges.

Three levels of authority identified include governing powers, governing/coordinating powers, and coordinating powers. (Table I). A great deal of research has been aimed toward proving the superiority of one type or another of state-level authority or of the scope of institutions under the jurisdiction of the state board. Hall surveyed board members in 1974 while Stuckman analyzed the organizational structure of the various agencies in 1971. Comparable studies have been undertaken by Glenny, Berdahl, Paola and others related to the overall coordinating boards or agencies charged with all of postsecondary education. From all of these studies, however, there has been no conclusive documentation that one structure is superior to another when considering the range of perspectives from that of improving statewide planning, or services to citizens, or working relationships between individual campuses in the state systems. All have flaws, but all, apparently, have some sustaining justification.

M. M. Chambers in 1961 placed the question into perspective when he observed the dilemma:

> South Dakota abolished institutional governing boards and set up one board in 1896 which now governs seven institutions. There have been sixty-four years of experience with this device. Who can prove, and by what techniques, that South Dakota's institutions of higher education are today any better (or any worse), or that the statewide system is any better or worse, than it would have been if separate governing boards had been continued, within open rivalry, or with voluntary coordination,

Table I

STATE-LEVEL BOARDS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1974.

Totals	Board Responsible for Community Colleges only	Board Responsible for All Higher Education	Board Responsible for University System	Board Responsible for all Levels of Education
Governing 10	Minnesota Delaware Connecticut Vermont 4	Georgia Utah West Virginia 3	Hawaii 1	Louisiana Tennessee 2
Governing/ Coordinating 11	Massachusetts Washington Virginia Arizona Colorado 5	0	Alaska Kentucky Nevada New York 4	Alabama Oregon 2
Coordinating 24	California Illinois Mississippi Maryland Wyoming South Carolina 6	Arkansas New Mexico New Jersey Ohio Oklahoma Texas Wisconsin 7	0	Maine Kansas Florida Idaho Michigan Missouri Montana North Carolina Pennsylvania Rhode Island Iowa 11
TOTALS 45	15	10	5	15

Modified from: Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi, State Level Boards for Community and Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination

or with a compulsory coordinating agency?[8]

Robert O. Berdahl a decade later reached a similar conclusion when he noted:

> One searches the relevant literature in vain for objective canons of proof which would remove the subject from controversy, but one finds only unsubstantiated and contradictory arguments as to why coordination is "good" or "bad", or why this type is preferable to that.[9]

Crucial Role of Advocacy: An interesting contrast in the patterns of coordination for state systems of higher education can be made with the community college systems. Whereas seven different states have changed their coordinating board structure for all of higher education during the last five years, none of the forty-five states having state-level boards or agencies for community colleges have changed their structure.* The implication, therefore, would seem to be that there has been general satisfaction with the design of state-level coordination for community colleges, regardless of the scope of responsibility and authority.

Such a conclusion, however, would be misleading.

---

[8] M. M. Chambers, Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1961.

[9] Robert O. Berdahl, Statewide Coordination of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

* The Nebraska legislature abolished its State Board for Technical Community Colleges during the 1975 legislative session following a state supreme court ruling that the funding structure of the statewide system was unconstitutional.

Several states have undergone significant changes in their operations due to internal administrative reorganization which has had an impact upon the agencies. Generally, these administrative changes have diffused decision making for community colleges among several organizational units at the expense of the state-level community college agency. In Pennsylvania, for example, the office of the commissioner of higher education was reorganized as part of a governmental effort to have agencies related to functions rather than to institutional missions. Whereas a Bureau of Community Colleges had existed from 1965 until 1969 with a state director and staff members responsible for facilities, academic program, occupational programs, and fiscal affairs, that bureau, in the same manner as corresponding bureaus for state colleges and for state-related universities, was essentially abolished as functional reorganization resulted in a Bureau of Academic Affairs with specialists responsible for the various institutional levels, and a Bureau for Physical Facilities. The net result was the absence of a specific state-level structure clearly identified with and in a position to provide advocacy for the community colleges. A similar reorganization occurred in New York, and similar proposals have surfaced in other states.

The fourteen community colleges in Pennsylvania soon developed an alternative pathway to the halls of the

legislature and to the offices of the Executive Branch by creating a state-level Commission on Community Colleges. The Pennsylvania state colleges have formed a commission similar to that of the community colleges, another commission already exists for independent colleges and universities, and a fourth commission within the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Universities champions the cause of the state-related universities. This example would seem to support the position that state-level advocacy is deemed necessary for any segment of education.

Success or failure of state-level boards or agencies normally is dependent more upon the role of the personalities than on the structure or range of powers of the organization. The approach and philosophy of the state director and his staff is central to the working relationships between the state and the local college. Those state directors who believe in the value of championing a high degree of self-determination at the local level can foster an operational design which achieves such an objective. This can be done in a state system with a governing structure as well as in either of the other two structures of governing/coordinating or coordinating. A posture of strong advocacy can be achieved by state directors even within a large unit such as a state board or department of higher education where internal policies and procedures channel and monitor legislative activities.

Where the state director works closely with the constituent community colleges, a network can be established which results in broad and forceful power and advocacy.

This is true, primarily, because of the fact that state staffs must act as negotiators and information gatherers/dispensers between the institutions and a myriad of state staffs ranging from the budget office to planning boards to facilities commissions to coordinating boards and licensing and certification boards.

The need for advocacy at the state level stems from the requirement that state government plays a crucial role in determining the nature, orderliness, and outcome of the process through which institutions adjust to changing times. Governmental policy will be fundamental in influencing the allocation of public resources and thus institutions must have an advocate in the state to plead their case and to press for their support.

Since funding has been viewed as the ultimate determinant in the source of power and authority, many community colleges have avoided urging greater participation in the financial support of community-based education from the state level for fear the prerogative of local policy making would be surrendered as a consequence. At least one model presently exists for avoiding such a loss. Florida, for the past five years, has quite successfully demonstrated

that full state funding of operating and capital costs can be put into effect while leaving institutional policy jurisdictions with a local board of trustees and maintaining a coordinating state structure for community colleges. Nevertheless, in Florida, the Division of Community Colleges is clearly structured for advocacy and serves that important function in championing the development and improvement of the colleges. In those states where local taxpayers have found the cost of public postsecondary education a burden either in the establishment of community-based institutions or to maintain existing ones, examination of the Florida model would be most appropriate.

Summary: The drift toward state control has emerged as much or more from external forces represented by the federal government, the courts and various national interest groups than it has from within each state itself. This condition is a result of a lack of self-determination and initiative by states, communities, and institutions which accepted the lure of federal dollars without regard to the concomitant administering machinery and requirements thereby created. Institutions often refused to acknowledge their primary responsibility was of human service rather than institutional self-interest which resulted in public demands for greater external structure and control at the state and federal level.

The question may be posed whether state control is inevitable, steerable, or whether the drift can even be reversed. The evidence would seem to suggest that the role of the state in assuring statewide public interest be served is firm and definite in the future. The nature and degree of control over the individual community college, however, does not necessarily mean the institution must operate as any other state agency. Rather, it has a mission and purpose which necessitates a different form and organization as will be described in Section III.

Section III

The College of the Community

> Hence the President's Commission suggests the name "Community College" to be applied to the institution designed to serve chiefly local community education needs. It may have various forms of organization and may have curricula of various lengths. Its dominant feature is its intimate relation to the life of the community it serves.[10]

This section addresses the emergence of a new mission for the community college which was proposed in the "national interest" as early as 1947. In the absence of any national policy to achieve the goal of community college education throughout the land, a patchwork-like development of state-initiated community college systems evolved. Unfortunately, the state perspective of the new institution being created in the 1960s failed to fathom the essential idea that a new social institution was needed, rather than a modified or truncated version of existing institutions of higher education. The legislators were shortsighted in perspective as were the community college educators themselves, for much of the confusion was the result of misguided priorities and emulation

---

[10] President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Volume I, Establishing Goals, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947, pp.67-68.

of baccalaureate college and university role models.

It is startling to some to learn that the tenets of community-based, performance-oriented postsecondary education enunciated by Pfifer (1974), and Gleazer (1974, 1975) and increasing numbers of educational leaders and scholars can be found in recommendations of the President's Commission on Higher Education nearly three decades ago when that study body brought national attention to the contemporary community college concept. It observed:

> Whatever form the community college takes, its purpose is educational service to the entire community, and this purpose requires of it a variety of functions and programs. It will provide college education for the youth of the community certainly, so as to remove geographic and economic boundaries to educational opportunity and discover and develop individual talents at low cost and easy access. But in addition, the community college will serve as an active center of adult education. It will attempt to meet the total post-high school needs of its community.[11]

Direct quotations from two of the documents produced by that President's Commission are used here to illustrate the legitimacy of the community college as the primary educational

---

[11] President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Volume III, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948, p.5.

institution to be responsible for community-based postsecondary education. Parenthetically, the quotes painfully confirm the adage that nothing is totally new but can frequently be rooted in earlier attempts of man to enunciate the ideal and thus set the goal for subsequent efforts and labors of those responsible for society's institutions. "Historically, it could be said that first came the change in name (community), then came the conditions (social-political forces) that pressed the college to become what the name stood for."[12]

Essential to a community-based institution is meaningful local input into priorities and policies relating to local services and programming. Harlacher has observed that in pragmatic terms, "'community-based" means delivering the kinds of education the community wants (not what pedagogues think is "good" for them) at locations where the learners are (not where traditional college organization indicates they should be); as determined by open community participation in defining comprehensive learning needs, suggesting solutions, and facilitating delivery. In the same manner, performance-oriented means "required competencies will fit the needs of

---

12 Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges, McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York: 1973.

the learner rather than the expectations of the teacher, so that competencies become more important than grades or credits and the learrer can measure in his own terms achievement of an objective without reference to the teacher's evaluation of it."[13]

Socialization Versus Social Reconstruction

The shift from meritocratic to egalitarian principles emanating from federal policy can be seen by contrasting the National Defense Education Act of 1958 with the Education Amendments of 1972. The NDEA authorized the U. S. Commissioner of Education to lend federal funds to colleges and universities for student loans to needy students. Preference was given, however, to academically superior students, and a forgiveness clause was incorporated for those who would subsequently enter the field of teaching. In 1965, Title IV of the Higher Education Act provided a revolutionary Educational Opportunity Grant program which for the first time offered federal scholarship grants to undergraduate students. The accompanying loan program of that law was also broadened and liberalized. With the enactment of the Education Amendments of 1972, however, we find the Basic Opportunity Grants provision providing a guarantee for all students requiring financial assistance.

---

13 Ervin L. Harlacher, "New Institutions for New Clientele", A paper presented at the Conference on Non-Traditional Educational Marketing and Delivery Systems, St. Louis, Missouri, January 15, 1975.

Academic scholarship is no longer the prerequisite as encompassed in the NDEA of 1958. The burden is no longer for the student to fit the institution but rather upon the institution to develop the programs and services which will accommodate the needs of the student. This philosophical shift from a meritocratic belief in higher education to an egalitarian philosophy has occurred in cadence with an array of other federal programs designed to enrich the quality of life of the individual as well as the community in which he lives.

The "Great Society Programs" of the 1960s added to the complexity of defining institutional response and generated expectations (even demands) from a variety of publics for more and sometimes quite different services. The question thus posed has been whether the historic basic purpose of socialization of education is enough. Increasingly, the community college is being called upon to adopt a philosophy of social reconstruction through direct involvement in the activities and efforts of the community. The contemporary role of the community college is rapidly broadening to include services and activities designed for improving the quality of life for the total community.

Addressing the need for the community college to contribute to the reconstruction of society, Young maintains recorded history verifies that societies which have not

provided for regeneration and reconstruction have stagnated, withered, deteriorated, and sometimes disappeared. He called upon the community college to serve as one of the primary delivery systems in serving the following needs:

> Develop a new attitude toward youth in our local communities and a new sense of responsibility for them.
>
> Reestablish the viability of life in the basic sociological unit, the family.
>
> Improve the conditions in the environment which militate against health.
>
> Inculcate a greater sense of humanity into society.
>
> Re-examine, reconfirm, and/or develop realistic value systems and codes of ethical behavior.
>
> Enhance the viability of community life.
>
> Provide for the fuller realization of self in the individual through more effective provisions of opportunity, need assessment, and means for development in positive ways which are contributory to the general welfare, regardless of the age of the individual.[14]

Social reconstruction is needed in urban, suburban, and rural communities alike. Each of these "communities" has

---

14 Raymond J. Young, "Concentration on Cooperation: Everybody's Duty, Each One's Goal", State-Local Agency and Community College Cooperation for Community Improvement, S. V. Martorana and James O. Hammons, Editors. The Pennsylvania State University, December, 1974, pp.18-19.

its own individual characteristics and set of problems to address. At the same time, however, it is society itself which is calling for its social institutions to surrender self-serving motives to that of human services which will achieve the better life through educational, social, cultural, and economic improvement.

Much of the seemingly directionless debate and activity within legislative halls, the courts, the churches, the municipal buildings, and even homes seeks a sense of stability and roots on the one hand while also struggling to meet the challenge of future change and conditions on the other hand.

Examination of the pattern of federal legislation as well as an examination of the public testimony before state legislative committees point to an expectation that an educational institution such as the community college in cooperation with other agencies of community, government, industry, and business should work cooperatively together in evolving a meaningful assessment of human and community needs to be served as well as the appropriate design and vehicle for serving them. Alan Pifer called upon the community college to assume the role of community leadership as its emerging major mission. This is in sharp contrast to the "town and gown" relationship which had characterized higher education for nearly two centuries.

Impediments

Among the impediments to achieving social reconstruction are the absence of a clearly articulated public policy with specific assignments given to various social agencies and organizations. Another impediment is the requirement to operate in an environment where political forces interact in shaping priorities and support bases... a reality which is antithetical to the historic tradition of higher education. Yet another impediment is the result of the condition of transience of a mobile society as described in Future Shock.

Some of the difficulties which exist or are emerging as a consequence of the lack of a clear plan of goals and responsibilities can be seen in the developing conflict between competing educational delivery systems. The imprint upon the direction of society made by philanthropic foundations and organizations is quite visible in this instance. Responding to the desire for enhancing the concept and reality of community, the Mott Foundation placed a high priority upon supporting the development of community schools and community education centers in recent years. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, on the other hand, for over a decade directed a generous portion of its resources to support the development of continuing education centers and programs at the university and college level. With the broadening demands of the public for life-long learning opportunities, delivery moved from a mode of the

client going to the institution to a new mode emerging with the institution going to the client. Overlapping or duplication of services and jurisdictional disputes among the educational delivery systems was thus almost inevitable. Since we tend to operate on a crisis basis, serious efforts to resolve the emerging problems of turfmanship and wasted resources was not to take place at the local level on a voluntary basis but rather was to be ignored until the conditions had developed to problematic proportions.

An additional impediment has been the ambiguity in the concept of community. While many definitions of community have been given, the concept itself is very difficult to generalize. As long as physical boundary lines, political entities, and geography are used, it is relatively easy to grasp; but as we address the social dimensions of community with such elements as neighborhood groups, ethnic constituencies or economic areas, the concept becomes blurred and more ambiguous. America is old enough to have communities which are at various stages of a life cycle. They come into existence, grow, change, and then can deteriorate and even die unless there are serious efforts to recycle. Communities are not only subject to change due to forces from without but are more dependent upon forces and relationships within. It is through interworking relationships of organizations and agencies that the vitality of communities can be sustained. Linkages

among these organizations are critical to community development and vibrant life.

Perhaps the major impediment may be lack of local initiative to address the requirements of social reconstruction. Too frequently the attitude at the local level is an expectation that " it will be done by the state." This apathy must be overcome by community colleges everywhere whether in rural, urban, or suburban communities.

Public Dismay: In the absence of local initiative to address the impediments to community development, several proposals have been advanced at national and state levels which could have tremendous impact upon the community college. The Newman Report proposed a configuration of higher education ranging from a national university to regional organizations. Peterson has argued for states to be subdivided into metropolitan areas or regions for the delivery of educational services and programs.[15] An extension of this concept has been advocated whereby the fifty states would be viewed as the basic service area with multi-state regions of the country given jurisdiction over policy and budget/program priorities for the socialization and social reconstruction roles of the formal educational system.

---

15 R. Peterson, "The Regional University and Comprehensive College: Some Ideas." In R.R. Perry and W. F. Hull (Eds.), The Organized Organization: The American University and Its Administration. Toledo: The University of Toledo, 1971, pp. 73-95.

Regional areas have been created by law or voluntarily in 37 different states designed to foster better cooperation among educational institutions and agencies in delivering educational programs and services. Several states have given the regional boards planning and program approval authority whereby veto powers can thwart a self-serving institution which does not take into account the total needs and resources of that region.

Evidence that extreme measures may be taken in the absence of educational leadership in resolving conflicts and duplication can be seen in a legislative bill introduced in the Florida legislature during the 1975 session by Senator Robert Graham, chairman of the Senate Education Committee. That bill, if enacted, would remove all existing state monies from school districts, area vocational schools, community colleges, and state universities which directly or indirectly support non-credit community educational services ranging from adult education through short-term workshops and all levels of manpower training or retraining. Senator Graham argues that an entirely new administrative structure should be established with twenty-eight areas (these conform to Florida's community college service area boundaries) identified and designated for all educational and training activities typically identified with community services and continuing education. Each area would have a Council for Community Educational Services

made up of lay citizens as policy makers to establish priorities for programs and allocate the public monies. The Council would have the authority to award contracts for services from educational institutions or other public or private agencies or organizations.

An administrative agency responsible to the Area Council would also be established, charged with the responsibility of assessing educational and training needs of the area and then prioritizing both the order in which the needs should be addressed and the capability of public and private educational agencies or institutions to serve the needs on a contractual basis. The bill further provides that entirely new or independent agencies or organizations can on a competitive basis bid to provide the community educational services sought by the Area Council.

The creation of ACCES, Area Council for Community Educational Services, generated much interest throughout the state. Public hearings held in at least three different locations resulted in staff reports which reflected the sobering observation that where any negative testimony had been presented at those hearings, it usually was directed at such political issues as the composition or method of selecting members for the area council or on the scope of powers identified with the area council or its administrative agency. There was noticeably little oppos ion to the concept

that non-educational organizations would be eligible to seek contracts to provide services.

The proposed bill calls for the area councils to work through the State Planning Council for Post High School Education, the Florida-designated 1202 Commission. This bill, even if not enacted in the present legislative session, should be interpreted by community colleges throughout the country as an indication of public dismay with the resistance of the educational community to aggressively undertake a self-appraisal and voluntarily remove the ambiguity and chaos which has developed from the diveristy of educational institutions over the years. It is evidence of intent of the legislature to establish statewide policies and structures which are perceived to better serve the public interest if local option does not demonstrate its ability to accommodate the educational needs of the public without regard to parochial or self-interest considerations.

Community colleges on the one hand have an opportunity to become the focal point for community-based postsecondary education. They must, however, collectively within each state clearly chart a course which removes them from the internecine conflicts and jurisdictional disputes which can only contribute to attrition and even failure.

Summary: The need for a social institution dedicated to personal and community development and renewal was enunciated as early as 1947 when the President's Commission on Higher

Education urged establishment of a community college with a different mission which would relate intimately to the life of the community served, whether rural, suburban, or urban in nature. That call was the beginning of a growing public awareness and demand for an educational institution which would accept social reconstruction as well as socialization as an appropriate responsibility and mission.

Because the earlier community college models tended to follow the patterns of the traditional four-year college model, they were pulled into the whirlpool of federal and state control mechanisms which impinged upon the local institution. Since it would be impossible for any institution to relate its services and programs to its community unless it is truly indigenous to that community, some design or provision for local policy making and priority setting is essential, regardless of the source of funding. It is to the implications for public policy which this situation presents that Section IV will be addressed.

Section IV

Implications for Public Policy

> One of our greatest challenges in the decades ahead will be to reeducate ourselves and others to different criteria of success where human services are concerned.[16]

Alan Pifer defined the leadership role community colleges should assume for social reconstruction, though admitting other institutions have a part to play in community-based postsecondary education, when he observed:

> ... I see the community college as the essential leadership agency.... They can become the hub of a network of institutions and community agencies... the high schools, the industry, the church, voluntary agencies, youth groups, even the prison system and the courts... utilizing their educational resources and, in turn, becoming a resource for them.[17]

When examining the effect of state impingements upon community colleges we find both "good" and "bad" occurring. On the one hand, the array of new agencies and organizations having responsibilities to champion the cause of target populations such as those for the veterans, senior citizens,

---

16 Louis W. Bender, "Planning After the Golden Decade", Improving Statewide Planning, New Directions for Higher Education, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Winter, 1974.

17 Alan Pifer, American Association of Community Junior Colleges Convention, February, 1974.

minority groups, women, as well as agencies or organizations charged with promoting public awareness and support of special community needs such as regional planning, manpower (Comprehensive Education Training Act), environmental agencies, transportation and numerous others can be "good." All provide potential for broadening the services and programs of the community-based community college. Provisions for identification of problems jointly as well as securing of appropriate financial support or program services all represent rich opportunities for the institution to utilize existing community and state agencies. On the other hand, the same agencies can often be obstructions to the community colleges when review or approval powers become obstacles to rapid and orderly development of programs, services, or needed facilities. It is in this domain that the art of individual and personal diplomacy becomes a key ingredient to effective community-based community college education.

It is quite clear that community colleges in the vanguard with successful community-based programs have cut themselves loose from extraneously imposed constraints of the higher education syndrome and have struck out in new directions which lead to truly community-committed development whether serving rural, suburban or urban constituencies. They interact with the array of agencies and organizations comfortably assuming the stances of catalyst, broker, partner, or servant. But these

new and different directions justify, and in fact call for, local policy-making citizen-centered bodies which can assure the individuality of each institution and a pluralistic system of community colleges to serve a pluralistic democratic society.

Community-based community colleges cannot be viewed as state-owned or operated institutions. Too frequently state legislatures view them as a state agency rather than a state government corporation receiving a state subsidy for their operation as the appropriate model, regardless of the funding formula of a given state.

As Gleazer has pointed out, " The fact is that on the whole the entire array of laws and policies governing community colleges view them as followers in higher education rather than 'leaders in community development.'" Community colleges must be viewed not as extensions of high school, truncated divisions of baccaluareate institutions, or even as "bridges" between high school and university. A separate profile must be perceived by legislator and taxpayer alike of an institution designed to serve the requirements of individual and community development.

State-level advocacy for community colleges is needed, however. While some administrators and faculty would argue such a function could be achieved outside the governmental structure through a voluntary organization, such is not true.

Statewide public good must take precedence over institutional self-interest. Since resources are limited, only through a state governmental agency can equity of treatment to individual colleges be guaranteed while assurance given that prudent use of public monies will result in maximum services for state as well as local needs.

Various interests are suggesting the possibility that some states many need to create new institutions devoted exclusively to non-traditonal learning. These pressures represent only the tip of the iceberg, for beneath the surface related problems and issues are lurking. The growing competition for the "new student clientele" and for non-traditional programs will bring pressures upon state agencies to referee competing claims of institutions. Further difficulties of generating funds for experimentation and innovation will occur as states face financial stringencies. All of these issues suggest a more activist role for state-level boards or agencies for community colleges in the years ahead. The manner in which such state agencies and their constituent community colleges interact will determine the future. An interdependency has evolved since the community colleges are under pressure from newly emerging units of federal and state government while the state agencies are under attack by various interests to win assignment of jurisdiction and authority previously in the province of the community college agency. Unless each vigorously supports the other, both will lose.

Paramount to the question of control of the community college is its mission and purpose. This monograph has outlined the variety of external forces which have contributed to a distortion of the organizational structure needed for that social institution dedicated to community development.

The AACJC Board of Directors has set the course for national public policy through its vision and design of the newly articulated Association mission: "To provide national leadership of community-based, performance-oriented post-secondary education." To achieve the true mission of the community college as the institution to carry this out, however, new legislation at the state level will need to be forged and new dimensions of service will need to be developed. Some recommendations for action are proposed to that end.

Recommendations

1. Mission:
   It is recommended that a national mission statement for the community college be developed together with a model omnibus legislative package which clearly spells out the philosophy, purpose, and mission of the contemporary community college for adoption by each state legislature.

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the Education Commission of the States should seek creation of another President's Commission Study or assume responsibility for establishing a national task force to design such model legislation as each has done in the past.

2. Locus of Policy-making:
It is recommended that every state provide substantive local participation in policy, priority and program directions for the community college regardless of the state structure in existence.

In those states where a state system exists, state laws or regulations should be changed or the state director should through administrative directives provide for creation and operation of a local policy-making body with powers over daily programmatic operations of the college.

3. Overlapping Jurisdictions:
It is recommended that each state legislature commission a study of the proliferation of "control" groups which have resulted from new federal and state policies. Remedial steps should be taken to correct the overlapped jurisdictions which have developed.

In those states where legislatures or the governor fail to undertake such corrective efforts, university leadership programs should direct research investigators toward the same phenomenon.

4. Internecine Warfare:
It is recommended that the community colleges in each state work closely to establish their mission and role by virtue of close cooperation among institutions and with their state agency. A positive approach to initiate articulation and cooperative working relationships should then be launched with the help of the AACJC.

It is suggested that the AACJC seek cooperation and develop a position paper with the other appropriate national

organizations at One Dupont Circle which could foster better coordination and cooperation within the states.

5. Local Initiative:
It is recommended that community colleges become more involved in the political process by establishing and maintaining positive communications with state and national legislators residing in the service area and by generating strong power bases from alumni, community leaders, employers of graduates, businessmen, labor, community groups and the like.

It is suggested that systematic approaches be used (1) in states through the state agency as coordinator and (2) at the national level through the AACJC as coordinator.

These five recommendations need concerted effort by all parties in the third evolutionary stage of community college development. The complex economic and political problems which will continue to confront us in the years ahead make it imperative that those who serve in community-based institutions work with others within the community and at state and federal levels. Better understanding of the interdependent relationships at all levels is basic to successful service to the people and their communities.

A strong advocacy agency or board for community colleges is needed at the state level in order for community colleges to have a significant voice in formulation of regulations and standards by the various administering arms of government as well as commissions and other organizations established as a

consequence of federal programs or public pressures. In its advocacy role, the state community college agency or board should perceive its purpose as service, leadership, representation, and defender of the community-based institutions.

Substantive local participation in policy making is fundamental to the basic tenets of community-based community colleges for they must be as individualistic, diverse, and heterogeneous as the different communities themselves. State legislators, state board members, and state officials must recognize that the American ideal of a pluralistic society is predicated upon each community reflecting the unique characteristics of geography, customs, demography, resources, and ethnic groups, as well as political and spiritual inclinations.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
SEP 29 1975
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION